Dear Jim,

1/31/75

For the moment I think no useful purpose is to be served by trying to think through what can be represented by what Warner told you. Enough is obvious. They have reached a decision and it limits our options as they have decided which of theirs they prefer.

I do think it represents something else. Warner could not have had old OSS files in mind when he earlier told you he had obtained a "few things." We discussed that with him and we all knew that would exist. So he "found" nothing in looking at it.

His use of the word "criminal" is interesting and may represent the line of the decision. Not right or wrong. Only not what could put people in jail. Well, I didn't think they had commited any crimes in the sense he used the word. Ought to be but isn't.

My writing make impossible that there was no interest in me, aside from what we have. With this interest, as I indicated to him, it is inevitable that if they did nothing else they collected what was available from other agencies.

They may decide that this was all no more than "public relations."

Whether or not speed is indicated is also something I have not recently thought through. Had we been able to get started earlier I'd have been all for it. I tend to be now but I'm not certain. I do think that if we are deposing during hearings it could be helpful if only as a discouragement to false swearing. But then they might argue a conflict with the hearing, claiming intereference.

Once a complaint is filed it is possible to speed things up if there is a good reason for it. There can well be. So, perhaps filing a complaint should come soon.

Unless you feel the need I see no reason to fool around with Warner and the non-games. He lied to us or he is a fool. He can't know that there was any respone to me without having or having the need to get a copy of that to which response was made. Besides, the original letter supposedly was lost and the copy he had thus was with the second, unless my recollection is wrong. This means lying.

These are the guys whose one purpose in training cops from major cities was to teach them reconrd keeping?

He had to know more that the copy of the letter on his desk reflected to know that a copy of Helms' speech was sent me. That was not until after the second letter, the rest of which was not responded to.

Have we exhausted our administrative remedies? If we have not in your opinion then I'd suggest that you write a new letter and not give him copies of anything. We should them get together on the precise wording of the new letter. It has to include what was done <u>for</u> them. They manufacture fig leafs for themselves and can later say, "Oh, that's not us" in referring to a proprietary.

We don't even know what they intend by "games" they are not, allegedly, playing.

Our language should include what they obtained from other federal and non-federal agencies, public or private. If the personnel file is immune, we should be careful not to run into the old "investigatory files" problem with the Ray material, hiding by misfiling. And if we have to give a date, how about beginning on or before 11/22/63?

If CTV is for Tuesday, I have medical appointments through the morning, last 21:30. Hvae to make for after lunch. If they want this day, you and I could meet at GHA.

Best,